REMARKS

All the pending claims call for an element having a non-monotonic response to user actuation. An example of non-monotonic response is set forth in Figure 7 and a non-monotonic response is explained in the specification at page 5, lines 6-19.

The cited reference to Selig does not teach such an element having a non-monotonic response. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To the extent that it is suggested that a touch screen inherently provides a non-monotonic response, it is respectfully submitted that this cannot be so. A touch screen is a rigid element and cannot provide a non-monotonic response.

There are lots of responses that the keys in the cited reference could provide other than non-monotonic, including constant, ramp shaped, etc. In order to make out a rejection based on inherency, the required showing that the reference could operate in no other way is not met. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 3, 2004

Timothy N/Trop, Reg. No. 28,994

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100

Houston, TX 77024 713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]